

Date of decision: 1-5-1996

For Approval and Signature

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. K. KESHOTE

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

Coram: S.K. KESHOTE, J  
(1-5-1996)

ORAL JUDGMENT:

None present for the petitioner.  
Ms. Sejal Mandavia for the respondents.

The matter was taken up in the first, second and finally in the third round. No body appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sejal Mandavia, learned counsel for the

respondents contended that it is a case of giving appointment to the petitioner only for 29 days, and this court has already decided identical issue in special civil application No.225 of 1986 and other allied matters on 13-3-1996. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the submission made on behalf of the respondents. It is a case where the petitioner has been given appointment only for 29 days. The first appointment was given on 1-6-1981. His services were terminated on 31st January 1982. It is not the case of termination of services as alleged but it is a case where fixed term appointment of the petitioner had come to an end by efflux of time. Looking to the nature of temporary appointment, no order of termination was required to be passed. No legal or fundamental right of the petitioner is infringed and the petitioner has no case whatsoever on merits which calls for interference by this court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

2. In the result the writ petition fails and the same is dismissed. Rule discharged.

.....